R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 901 24

PUPIL EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR.
BY- SMITH, LOUIS M.
WASHINGTON UNIV., ST.LOUIS, MO.,GRAD.INST.OF EDUC.
REPORT NUMBER CRP-570 PUB DATE 60
CONTRACT OEC-570(8183)
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.60 40P.

DESCRIPTORS- TEACHERS, *BEHAVIOR, *LEADERSHIP, QUESTIONNAIRES, STUDENTS, *TEACHER ATTITUDES, *TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, TEACHER RESPONSIBILITY, *SUBURBAN SCHOOLS, STUDENT ATTITUDES, STUDENT TEACHER RELATIONSHIP, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

THE OBJECTIVES WERE TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE EXPECTATIONS OF TEACHER BEHAVIOR, AND TO ANALYZE THESE EXPECTATIONS IN TERMS OF THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THE TEACHER. ELEMENTARY PUPILS (140), JUNIOR HIGH (148), AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (140) STUDENTS FROM A SUBURBAN ST. LOUIS SCHOOL DISTRICT COMPRISED THE SAMPLE. AN ADAPTATION OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FROM THE OHIO STATE STUDIES IN LEADERSHIP WAS GIVEN TO ALL CHILDREN, AND ADDITIONAL DATA ON INTELLIGENCE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, AND OTHER IDENTIFYING FACTORS WERE GATHERED. THE CONCLUSIONS DRAWN WERE THAT TEACHER BEHAVIOR IS AMENABLE TO ANALYSIS IN TERMS OF LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS OF ROLES. PUPILS EXPECT TEACHERS TO BE HIGH ON CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE. GRADE LEVEL IS RELATED TO EXPECTATIONS. SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS EXPECT MORE LEADERSHIP AND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS EXPECT LESS. (GC)

ED 029 01

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Pupil Expectations of Teacher Leadership Behavior

Cooperative Research Project No. 570(8183) *

Louis M. Smith

Graduate Institute of Education
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri
1960

*The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

3414

Preface

The investigator wishes to thank Mr. Edward Merryman, Assistant Superintendent of the R-9 District, St. Louis County, Missouri, for permission to work in the public schools. To the principals, teachers, and pupils in the system who helped and cooperated in the project, the investigator is indebted. Mr. William Dannemeier and Mr. Praful Dave, graduate assistants in education at Washington University aided in the collection and analysis of the data. Finally, a debt is owed to the writer's colleagues, especially Dr. Bryce Hudgins, and the writer's students who have reacted critically to many of the ideas presented in this report.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	1
Contents	ii
Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Methodology	4
Sample	4
Measuring Instruments	5
Statistical Analysis	5
Results	6
General	6
Correlates of Expectations	7
Discussions and Implications	14
Summary and Conclusions	27
References	28
Appendix	
A. Questionnaire	
B. Table 10	
C. Table 11	

TABLES

1. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration in the Eighteen Intact Classroom Groups Page 8

2. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure in the Eighteen Intact Classroom Groups Page 9

3. Two Part Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure for Twelve Groups Tested Under Different Experimental Conditions. Page 12

4. Complete Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure Under Grade Level, Sex, and Activity Conditions Page 13

5. Two Part Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration for Twelve Groups Tested Under Different Experimental Conditions Page 15

6. Complete Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration Under Grade Level, Sex, and Activity Conditions Page 16

7. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure Scores with High and Low Ability Groups Page 17

8. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration with High and Low Ability Groups Page 18

9. Specification, After McClelland, of Personality Variables Suitable for a Genetypical Analysis of the Present Classroom Problem Page 26

10. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration Under These Levels of Paternal Occupation for a Selected Sample of Junior and Senior High School Students Appendix B

11. Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure Under Three Levels of Paternal Occupation for a Selected Sample of Junior and Senior High School Students Appendix C

Introduction

In examining, theoretically and practically, the functioning of a classroom, one immediately moves to the role and behaviors of the teacher. This study explores one aspect of this problem, the role of the teacher, by concentrating on those behaviors indicative of leadership. Rather than analyzing how different teachers actually behave in the classroom, the study focuses on the pupil expectations of the teacher's behavior, as these expectations are related to particular pupil characteristics and classroom situations.

The present writer on another occasion (23) has looked to the varying ways in which psychological and educational theorists have described the interaction of teachers and pupils. An early study by Lippitt (21) characterized the behaviors of youth workers as autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. At approximately the same time, H. H. Anderson (4) moved from studying the interaction of preschool children to the study of interaction between teachers and pupils. He retained his conceptual framework and referred to "teacher personalities" as dominative and integrative. In most, but not all, respects these concepts parallel Lippitt's autocratic and democratic concepts. Shortly after this, Withall (29) proposed an observational scheme for measuring the social emotional climate of the classroom. He provided a background for possible confusion of teacher behavior and classroom group factors in that he measured the group atmosphere or climate through teacher verbal behaviors. More careful argument might pin point the teacher's behavior as one of the most important determinants of classroom climate, but not the only one. For instance, the "climate" of a class of emotionally disturbed children has important determinants outside the

teacher. Nonetheless, Withall introduced his concepts as continuum from teacher centered to pupil centered. His conception parallels the earlier notions of autocratic and democratic. More recently, Cogan (7) has entered this area and introduced the concepts disjunctive, conjunctive, preclusive and inclusive. His disjunctive-conjunctive continuum defines teaching behaviors such as level of demand, ability to communicate and classroom management. Preclusive refers to dominant, aggressive and rejecting ideas, partly isomorphical, to dominative and autocratic. Inclusive in turn is similar to integrative and democratic, for Cogan expressly refers to integrative, affiliative and nurturant behaviors. The literature on teacher attitudes, especially the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI),(8) bears on the same problems. This inventory has its roots in the early ideas of Erich Fromm (12) and the more recent F scale literature and investigations (1). Finally, the multitude of personality trait studies typified by Hart (15) and Witty (30) bear upon the problem of this investigation.

To the present writer , these points of view do not adequately represent for several reasons the phenomenon of teacher-pupil interaction. Some time ago, Charters (5) raised for the present writer the issue that the classroom is part of a larger organization, the school building and system; he theorized that the role of the teacher is limited, or prescribed in part, because of this. Similarly, the school has certain functions to carry out in the community and because of this the teacher must behave in many regards as leaders in other institutions must behave (18). Such reasoning, as well as the possible multidimensionality of earlier concepts, i.e., Withall's "learner centered" teacher, may be

learner centered and be essentially praising and supportive, or nondirectively accepting, or nondirectively problem oriented. Similarly, a "teacher-centered" teacher could be unemotional, problem oriented, and directive or punitive, reproving, and disparaging, or quite defensive. To add one further overlapping of concepts, Lippitt and White's autocratic leaders were also the leaders who praised the most; praise is part of integrative and learner centered teachers' roles in the Anderson and Withall conceptions.

The present investigation centered on the two leader behavior roles, Initiating Structure and Consideration, as these have been described in the Ohio State Leadership Studies (14, 24). The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was adapted to refer to teachers and classes, to lower reading levels, and to fit expectations rather than actual performance. Essentially, the dimension Initiating Structure refers to the teacher's fulfillment of roles in directing, guiding, and structuring group goal setting and group locomotion to goals. This role is not perfectly correlated with Consideration, that is, being concerned for the individual, making it pleasant to be a member of the class, and being friendly and easy to talk to. This investigation sought answers to the pupils expectations for the fulfillment of each of these roles, that is, Do children expect teachers to be Considerate? and, Do Children expect teachers to Initiate Structure?

Beyond the question of the general level of expectations and the variation of these expectations from class to class, the question of correlates of these expectations must be answered. At this point, the variables selected rested mostly in the "action" rather than the "theoretical" area. Since pupils are grouped by age and grade levels,

the question was raised about differences in expectations in elementary, junior and senior high schools. Second, since considerable study of variations in school behavior and school accomplishment between boys and girls has been reported, sex differences in expectations were investigated. Intelligence is the most significant correlate of academic achievement; currently there is considerable discussion of ability grouping, consequently intellectual differences were related to expectations. Discussion has been made of differences in teaching various subject matter areas, therefore, expectations in mathematics and social studies were investigated. Finally, considerable discussion about social class influences on attitudes and values suggested this as an appropriate variable.

Methodology

Sample

Four hundred and twenty-eight (428) children from a suburban school district in St. Louis County comprised the sample. One hundred and forty came from six elementary school classrooms in three different schools. They were all sixth graders. One hundred and forty-eight were from the seventh and eighth grades in the junior high school and one hundred and forty were from the ninth, tenth, and eleventh grades in the senior high school. Two hundred and six were in arithmetic or mathematics classes and two hundred twenty-two were in social studies and history classes. One hundred seventy-eight were girls and two hundred and fifty were boys. Approximately half (216) were below and half (212) were above 105 I.Q.

Measuring Instruments

The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was adapted to fit the classroom setting. The dimensions contained in this instrument are Initiating Structure and Consideration. They are the operational definitions of teacher leadership behavior.

The independent variables were measured quite simply and matter of factly. Grade in school was broken into three levels, elementary, junior, and senior high school. Pupils were selected as they were students in on-going or "intact" classes. Activity was broken nominally into mathematics and social studies; students were in such on-going classes. Each pupil was tested with the Otis Quick Scoring Test of Mental Ability. The average score was 105; "bright" and "dull" groups were formed on this basis. Self report was used to determine the sex of the pupil.

Statistical Analysis

The original intent of the experimenter was to analyze the data in two complex factorial problems, one for Initiating Structure and one for Consideration. In this manner the major effects of ability, sex, grade level, activity and socio-economic status could be determined. Any interactive effects, first order, second, etc., could also be determined. Two problems prevented this. First, the socio-economic data obtained were not complete on all the cases and the community from which the children were drawn was quite homogeneous, that is, mostly skilled labor, minor office and clerical workers, and small shop owners. Further discussion will be made of this later. Second, when the intelligence variable was introduced into the design, serious disproportionalities occurred in the junior high level and a negative

interaction occurred. Since there are no simple techniques for handling such a statistical problem, the decision was made to analyze the intelligence data separately for tentative results rather than firm conclusions.

Results

General

The expectations of pupils were scored as indicated in the manual with values on each item ranging from a possible high of 4 to a low of 0. This provides a maximum score of 60 and a minimum of zero for each 15 item scale. The results for Consideration are a mean of 46.28 and standard deviation of 5.50 and for Initiating Structure a mean of 43.52 and a standard deviation of 5.96. The means are significantly different, t = 7.52. These average expectations are higher than the rated actual behaviors of three samples of leaders presented in the manual of the LBDQ. There is no available data for adequate comparisons of expectations for leaders of other groups or actual behavior of teachers. The present results indicate (1) pupils expect teachers to be high on both dimensions of leader behavior, and (2) pupils expect teachers to be relatively higher on consideration than initiating structure.

When the 18 on-going, intact classrooms are compared in terms of average expectations significant differences are found on both dimensions. The F value from Tables 1 and 2 are both significant beyond the one per cent level. In short, teachers can expect to find classes of students to vary on both dimensions in their expectations for her behavior. The implications of this for teacher flexibility in approach

will be discussed more extensively later. The correlates of expectations of individual pupils will be analyzed in the next section.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

The correlation, r = 19, between the pupils expectations for initiating structure and consideration is significantly different from zero. Even so, it is not a very strong relationship. Such a result allows several interpretations: First, a response set, if present at all, is not over-riding in determining the scores of the pupils. A very high correlation between the two would have made subsequent interpretations of results more difficult. Second, knowing the expectations of a pupil for one aspect of a teacher's behavior does not allow one to predict very well his expectations for the other. Third, there is an implicit conflict possible when the teacher's behavior is such to fulfill both roles or neither. Fourth, this relationship tends to be lower than the .30 to .50 coefficients found between Initiating Structure and Consideration when the leaders are rated in terms of what they do rather than what is expected of them.

Correlates of Expectations

1. Preliminary Comments.

As mentioned earlier, the original intent was to analyze the expectations of pupils in terms of the five independent variables and their interactions. The ability and socio-economic status variables presented separate difficulties, consequently, the variation in expectation was analyzed for relationships with grade level, sex, and activity. At this point, it might be well

TABLE 1

Analysis of Variance of Expectations for
Consideration in the Eighteen Intact Classroom Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1,068.04	17	62.83	2.17	<.01
Within Groups	11,858.75	410	28.92		
Total	12,926.79	427			

TABLE 2

Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure in the Eighteen Intact Classroom Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1,702.48	17	100.15	3.04	<.01
Within Groups	13,506.41	410	32.94		
Total	15,208.89	427			

to indicate the nature of these difficulties. First, the community selected for the data collection is a lower middle class suburban community. The investigator assumed there would be sufficient heterogeneity to test the hypothesis of socio-economic differences. Inspection of the data revealed few unskilled and professional occupations among the parents. Almost all of the parents are semi-skilled and skilled tradesmen, minor office employees, small businessmen. When a sample of junior and senior high school students was drawn to check differences in socio-economic status an analysis of professional (physicians and ministers mostly), skilled trades, semi-skilled (mostly truck drivers and routemen) no differences in expectations for Consideration nor Initiating Structure were found. The analysis of variance results are presented in the Appendix; however, the investigator does not believe a fair test of the hypothesis was made.

The ability or intelligence data presented a different problem. These data were carefully collected and entered initially into the analysis of variance problems. In the analysis of the results a negative interaction appeared. Such a result usually can be attributed to arithmetical calculations. In this instance it was localized in disproportionality in the cells due to the ability variable. A resolution of the problem was difficult because no procedures have been worked out for a factorial problem of this complexity (25). The alternatives seemed to be a random elimination of cases from particular cells or a separate, and consequently, tentative analysis of the ability data. The latter alternative was chosen.

2. Grade level, activity, and sex.

The Initiating Structure scores as they are related to the three independent variables, grade level, activity, and sex are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The overall test of the differences between the groups indicates that a portion of the variance in Initiating Structure can be attributed to these variables. When the influence is localized it is found that only grade level is related to Initiating Structure. The junior high school group expects the least teacher behavior of this sort and the high school group expects the most. The mean scores are: Elementary 43.33; Junior High 42.05; and Senior High 45.25. Boys and girls do not differ in their expectations: mean of boys is 43.5, and girls' mean is also 43.5. Activity or subject content, that is, mathematics and social studies, also does not influence expectations for Initiating Structure: mean of mathematics classes is 43.2 and the social studies mean is 43.9.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 about here

Expectations for the leader behavior dimension, Consideration, were found to be influenced by none of the variables, grade level, activity, and sex. The overall test of significance is presented in Table 5. Table 6 presents the analysis of the between groups variance into components of activity, grade level, and sex. Table 1 indicates that classrooms do differ in the pupil expectations for Consideration. The determinants of this fall elsewhere in the present variables. Classroom norms and uninvestigated personality variables are possible alternatives.

TABLE 3

Two Part Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure for Twelve Groups Tested Under Different Experimental Conditions

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1,072.06	11	97.48	2.87	<.01
Within Groups	14,136.83	416	33.98		
Total	15,208.89	427			

TABLE 4

Complete Analysis of Variance of
Expectations for Initiating Structure
Under Grade Level, Sex, and Activity and < Conditions

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
A Grade Level	742.18	2	371.09	10.92	<.01
B Activity	51.77	1	51.77	1.52	>.05
C Sex	.28	1	.28		
A x B	176.39	2	88.20	2.60	>.05
A x C	21.69	2	10.84		
B x C	7.17	1	7.17		
A X B x C	72.58	2	36.29	1.06	>.05
Within Groups	14,136.83	416	33.98		
Total	15,208.89	427			

Insert Tables 5 and 6 about here

3. Intelligence.

Each of the 428 children in the sample was given the appropriate form, Beta or Gamma, of the Ohio Quick Scoring Test of Mental Ability. The distribution was divided at the average score and high-low ability groups were obtained. The separate tests of the relationship between ability and expectations of teacher leadership behavior are reported in Tables 7 and 8. In this sample, ability is related significantly in a positive direction. The more able students expect the teacher to be higher on this dimension than do the less able students. Such a relationship was not found for expectations on the Consideration dimension. Ability is unrelated to these expectations.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here

Discussion and Implications

Recently, Gross of Harvard has commented in regard to problems and proppects in educational sociology:

> A priority problem area...is analysis of the role definitions of teachers and students. There have been many statements about the expected behaviors that are associated with these positions, but we have little information about the actual expectations students hold for teachers... (13, pp. 16-17)

The present investigation demonstrates that it is possible to take a series of questions about teacher behaviors and link them to a fruitful social psychological position. As these questions retain the intention of the Ohio State University investigators (14, 24) they

TABLE 5

Two Part Analysis of Variance of
Expectations for Consideration for Twelve
Groups Tested Under Different Experimental Conditions

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	258.21	11	23.47	--	--
Within Groups	12,668.58	406	31.20		
Total	12,926.79	417			

TABLE 6

Complete Analysis of Variance of
Expectations for Consideration Under
Grade Level, Sex, and Activity Conditions

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
A Grade Level	29.60	2	14.80	--	--
B Activity	4.00	1	4.00	--	--
C Sex	4.10	1	4.16	--	--
A x B	57.80	2	28.90	--	--
A x C	18.10	2	9.05	--	--
B x B	75.50	1	75.50	2.42	>.05
A x B x C	67.10	2	34.05	1.09	>.05
Within Groups	12,668.58	416	31.20		
Total	12,926.79	427			

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance of Expectations for
Initiating Structure With High and Low Ability Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	467.02	1	467.02	13.49	<.01
Within Groups	14,741.87	426	34.61		
Total	15,208.89	427			

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variation of Expectations for Consideration With High and Low Ability Groups

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	18.15	1	18.15	--	--
Within Groups	12,908.64	426	30.20		
Total	12,926.79	427			

allow certain interpretations. First, the pupil expectations of the teacher's role or pattern of interaction with the pupils suggests that Consideration and Initiating Structure are important concepts. The pupils expect teachers to take an interest in them as individuals, to make it pleasant to be a member of the class, and to listen to their ideas and suggestions. Similarly, expectations are held for teachers to take an active, directive, standards maintaining role.

While this may seem self evident to some teachers and professional educators, such an interpretation is not obvious from such experimental literature as cited in the introduction to this report. The two dimensions suggested in the pupil expectations should call for a re-analysis of the widely quoted and widely utilized concepts: teacher centered, pupil centered, dominative, integrative, autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. The present investigator sees the two dimensional concept of leadership handling a problem observed and reported by Withall (29) in his doctoral dissertation. He summarized student reaction to an extremely "learner centered classroom" defined by his observation schedule.

> The picture of the learning situation and pupil-teacher relationship obtained from these evaluation sheets filled out by the pupils is, on the whole, one of an impartial and cooperative individual who helped the learners to get some new ideas, but who, despite the pleasant interpersonal relationships she created with them, did not, from their frame of reference, help them sufficiently in identifying new problem areas and did not help them visualize the action possibilities arising from such problems. This teacher, it would appear, did not adequately structure the situation for the learners so that they could identify and work upon problems that were challenging to them and pertinent to their interests. The constant reiteration by members of the class in their evaluation scales that they wasted their time and were bored, may be due to the fact that lack of structuring by the teacher

> frustrated many of them. The teacher seems to have related herself adequately as an individual to the majority of the pupils but this satisfactory social relationship failed to meet the needs and expectancies of the learners in so far as problem solving and learning activities were concerned. (29, pp 83-84)

Although considerable research remains to be done to clarify fully this conception of the teacher as a leader, the present investigator feels that as a tentative frame of reference it is quite fruitful.

Within the content of group functioning, the present results suggest important application for the commonly described phenomenon, "respect for a teacher." Hollander (16) has suggested the concept idiosyncracy credits, an accumulation of positively disposed impressions, as a means of handling some of the conceptual problems found in relating leader behavior to group functioning. The essence of his argument is this: as the leader conforms to the norms (expectations) of the group he builds idiosyncracy credits or favorable impressions with the group. These credits may be expended in moving the group toward new goals and new norms. The leaders influence depends, in part, on the balance between building and expending idiosyncracy credits. Insofar as the fulfillment of these leader roles are important norms in the group, they are critical for the respect in which the teacher is held and also for her ability to influence the classroom group. As Hollander comments:

> Leadership status, therefore, assuredly demands conformity to the groups expectancies regarding the role, but still leaves the leader with sway in the sphere of common expectancies associated with members at large. The leader may deviate from these, or bring about their reconstruction, if his prior activities have generated an appropriately high level of credit. (16, p. 125.)

Della Piana and Gages'(10) investigation of cognitively and affectively oriented classes and the MTAI scores of the teachers would corroborate the present finding, expectations vary from class to class. Their study extends the Hollander idiosyncracy point and the present interpretation that not only the interaction of teachers and pupils can be related to pupil evaluations, but that the underlying attitudes of the teacher are conceptually and empirically interrelated. Hudgins and Smith (19) are following the thesis that one aspect of classroom effectiveness (task orientation) and efficiency (pupil satisfactions) is the congruence in the teacher's leader behavior and the expectations of the pupils for such leader behavior. As such relationships are clarified, movement toward a theory of classroom functioning should be enhanced.

Relative variations in fulfilling leader roles of Consideration and an elaboration of Initiating Structure (nominally called Teacher Competence) as these influence quantity and quality of pupil work and study in high school science is the subject of an investigation by Allenstein (12). Ultimately, it is hoped that variations in these teacher roles as they relate to the learning of knowledge such as specific information, concepts, general principles, and theory as well as their contribution to learning of intellectual skills such as application, analysis, and evaluation will be pursued.

Discussion is required concerning the correlates of pupil expectations. In the original design of this investigation, the writer was interested in the application to the classroom of Homans' conception of The Human Group (17). Expectations could be viewed as norms, leader

behavior as one aspect of a combination of interaction and sentiment, and mathematics and social studies as two kinds of activities. This conception has indicated some of the kinds of mutual dependency that exists between important classroom variables. We have discussed some of the implications of the group norm for the teacher leadership role, as such a role is a combination of interaction and sentiment. At this point it is important to note that this sample of children expected the teacher to be higher on Consideration than Initiating Structure, even though the teacher is generally expected to be high on both. It is important to note also that this general frame of reference is unrelated to the activity, the subject matter being taught. From this limited social psychological frame of reference, teaching mathematics and teaching social studies is not different. Other ways of dimensionalising interaction, norms, sentiments and activities are possible; it is hoped that these will be pursued.

The age, sex, and ability correlates of pupil expectations have also been investigated. These "personality" variables are in the tradition of individual differences and differential psychology (3). They are what Kelley and Thibaut (21) have called "social engineering variables." As an aspect of applied psychology and in terms of the distinctions made in training teachers for elementary, junior high, or senior high; in sectioning classes, ability grouping and classes for each discipline (mathematics and social studies); and the common construct "boys are... and girls believe..." the present variables are important and highly significant. Many day to day educational problems and decisions are formulated and specified in these terms. The present

results are striking on several counts. First, the expectations for Consideration do vary from intact class to intact class, but these expectations are unrelated to age, sex, and ability. As one teaches in an elementary school, junior high school, and senior high, there is no shift in these expectations. Possible differences in the specific behaviors implementing this role remain to be explored. Interesting also is the fact that the more able students do not differ from the less able students. Although the test was not made at the extremes of the distribution, a strong commonality of expectations is suggested. Finally, the lack of difference in expectations between boys and girls is quite surprising. Anastasi, in speaking of sex differences, has commented:

> Throughout this survey of sex differences in interests, preferences, attitudes, and values, we have encountered repeated evidence of the greater social orientation of women. This sex difference appears early in life and continues into old age. (3 p. 481)

The present results suggest as one interpretation that Consideration is more broadly interpretated than just a social and personal interest type of interaction. With the reported differences in quantity and quality of teacher-pupil contact, such as found by deGroat and Thompson (9), one wonders at the lack of difference in expectations and also the implications for classroom functioning of the present results. The interrelations between expectations of teacher leader behavior, perceptions of actual teacher leader behavior, and specific teacher-pupil contacts are under investigation (26) in experimental and naturalistic settings. Independent analysis of results from boys and girls seems imperative.

The expectations for Initiating Structure do relate to the measured "social engineering variables." First, however, is the finding of no difference in expectations for girls and boys. The same questions

raised in regard to the Consideration dimension seem applicable here. The curvilinear relationship between grade level and expectations for Initiating Structure are difficult to interpret. The expectation for least Initiating Structure at the Junior High level might possibly be related to the variety of struggles for independence characterising early adolescence. More genatypical analysis seems warranted here. Change in values with age and school drop outs might possible account for this higher expectations at the senior high level.

The positive relationship with ability is also difficult to interpret. Whether bright students see such behavior as more in accord with academic satisfactions which they can more easily attain is not clear from the present research. Once again, a more genetypical analysis is necessary.

The present investigator, in the process of data collection for this report, also gathered data for an analysis of related theoretical problems. The conception of personality into which these results integrate most neatly is that of McClelland (22). His approach involves the analysis of personality into three major components: motives, traits, and schema. A motive is "a strong, affective association, characterized by an anticipatory goal reaction and based on past association of certain cues with pleasure or pain." (22, p. 466) "A trait is the learned tendency of an individual to react as he has reacted more or less successfully in the past in similar situations when similarly motivated"(22, p. 216). Trait is comparable to the concept of habit. A schema is "a hypothesis or conception" (22, p. 254) or as more generally stated, the cognitive structure or constructs the individual has of the world about him. The present investigation,

in this context is a study of one portion of the schema of the individual, his expectations concerning teacher behavior. In the course of the investigation, data were collected on the motives of the individuals through T.A.T. type pictures. These stories are being analyzed for needs for achievement, affiliation and power. Also, peer nominations, "Guess Who", for various typical behavior patterns, scholarship, power, friendship were also obtained. These will be used as measures of the traits of the individuals. The variables are specified in Table 9.

Insert Table 9 about here

Beyond the analysis of broad relationships between schema, motives and traits, more specific hypotheses are raised, such as Consideration schema, and are functionally related to need Affiliation and traits of Acceptability Similarly, expectations for Initiating Structure schema are a function of need Achievement and need Power and traits of attributed power and nonconformity. The mutual interdependencies of such personality variables should bear upon personality theory in general, as well as permit more important theoretical conclusions as these relate to the implementation of personality theory in the analysis of classroom problems.

In short, such an analysis should move the educational psychologist closer to a conception of the classroom as a social system. Relevant group and individual variables will have been explored as they relate to a specific problem. Institutional influences await examination. (18)

TABLE 9

Specification, After McClelland, of Personality Variables Suitable for a Genotypical Analysis of the Present Classroom Problem

1. Schema
   - 1.1 Expectations for Consideration
   - 1.2 Expectations for Initiating Structure

2. Traits
   - 2.1 Acceptability
   - 2.2 Industriousness and Achievement
   - 2.3 Attributed Power
   - 2.4 Non-conformity
   - 2.5 Autonomy and Achievement

3. Motives
   - 3.1 Need Achievement
   - 3.2 Need Affiliation
   - 3.3 Need Power

Summary and Conclusions

1. Teacher behavior is amenable to analysis in terms of leadership dimensions or roles. There are indications of fruitfulness for theory, research and educational practice.
2. In general, pupils expect teachers to be high on Consideration and Initiating Structure. Expectations are higher on the former. Expectations for one role are only slightly predictable from knowledge of another role.
3. Intact classrooms vary from one another in expectations for both Consideration and Initiating Structure roles.
4. Consideration expectations varied among the 428 pupils. None of the independent variables, grade level, activity, sex, or intelligence, accounted for these differences.
5. Initiating Structure expectations varied among the 428 pupils. Sex and activity were unrelated to expectations. Grade level is curvilinearly related to expectations: senior high school students expect most and junior high school students expect least. Bright students expect more Initiating Structure than less able students do.
6. Theoretical positions of Horwitz (18), Homans (17), and Hollander (16) provide a basis for the group processes interpretation of the present results.
7. McClelland's theory of personality is useful in organizing the present results and suggesting an approach for analyzing additional data which have been collected.
8. This research is a portion of series of investigations on classroom functioning being undertaken by the present writer, his colleagues and students in the Graduate Institute of Education at Washington University.

REFERENCES

1. Adorno, T., et. al. The authoritarian personality, N. Y.: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

2. Allenstein, R., Personal communication, 1960.

3. Anastasi, Anne, Differential psychology, 3rd edition, N.Y.: MacMillan Co., 1958.

4. Anderson, H. H., et al, Studies in teachers' classroom personalities I, II, III, Appl. psychol. monogr., Nos. 6, 8, & 11, 1945-46.

5. Charters, W. W., Personal communication, 1958.

6. Clyburn, Mary, Personal communication, 1960.

7. Cogan, M. L., Theory and design of a study of teacher-pupil interaction, Harvard educ. Rev., 1956, 26, pp. 315-342.

8. Cook, W. W., et al, Manual: Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, N. Y.: The Psychological Corporation, 1951.

9. deGroat, A. F., and Thompson, G. C., A study of the distribution of teacher approval and disapproval among 6th grade pupils, J. exp. Educ., 18, 1949, pp. 57-75.

10. Della Piana, G. M., and Gage, N. L., Pupils' values and the validity of the MTAI, J. educ. Psychol., 46, 1955, pp. 167-178.

11. Edwards, A. H., Experimental design in psychological research, N. Y.: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1950.

12. Fromm, E., Escape from freedom, N. Y.: Rinehart, 1941.

13. Gross, N., Problems and prospects in the sociology of education, Unpublished manuscript, 1958.

14. Halpin, A. W., Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1957.

15. Hart, F. W., Teachers and teaching, N. Y.: MacMillan, 1934.

16. Hollander, E., Conformity, status and idiosyncracy credit, Psychol. Rev., 65, 1958, pp. 117-127.

17. Homans, G. C., The human group, N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950.

18. Horwitz, M., The conceptual status of group dynamics, Rev. educ. Res., 23, 1953, pp. 309-328.

19. Hudgins, B., Personal communication, 1960.

References (Cont'd)

20. Hudgins, B., and Smith, L. M., An analysis of laboratory and classroom group functioning. U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project.

21. Kelley, H., and Thibaut, J., Experimental studies of group problem solving and process. In G. Lindzey Handbook of social psychology, Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

22. McClelland, D., Personality, N.Y.: Dryden Press, 1951.

23. Smith, Louis M., Group processes in elementary and secondary schools, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1959.

24. Stogdill, R. M., and Coons, A. E., (Editors) Leader behavior: its description and measurement, Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Press, 1957.

25. Vanderplas, J., Personal communication, 1960.

26. White, R., and Lippitt, R., Leader behavior and member reaction in three social climates. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Ed.) Group Dynamics, Evanston, Ill.: 1953, pp. 585-611.

27. Whyte, W. F., Leadership and group participation. Ithaca, N. Y.: New York State School of Business and Labor Relations. Bull. #24, 1953.

28. Whyte, W. F., Street corner society, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

29. Withall, J., The development of a technique for the measurement of social-emotional climate in classrooms. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1948.

30. Witty, P., An analysis of the personality traits of the effective teacher, J. educ. Res., 40, 1947, pp. 662-671.

APPENDIX A

GRADUATE INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
STUDENT OPINION STUDY

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
SPRING, 1959

General Information

DIRECTIONS: Fill in each blank carefully and correctly.

1. Name_____
2. Birthdate_____
3. Sex: Boy_____ Girl_____
4. School_____
5. Grade_____
6. Subject_____
7. Father's Occupation
   1. Where does he work (what company)?_____
   2. What does he do there?_____
      _____

Teacher Description Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS:

a. READ each sentence carefully.

b. THINK about how frequently the teacher in a _____ class should do the things described by the sentence.

c. DECIDE whether the teacher should do the things described always, often, sometimes, not often, or never.

d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the sentence to show the answer you have chosen.

A - Always B - Often C - Sometimes D - Not Often E - Never

1. The teacher should do personal favors for the class members. A B C D E
2. The teacher should make the way he feels clear to the class. A B C D E
3. The teacher should do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the class. A B C D E
4. The teacher should try out his new ideas with the class. A B C D E
5. The teacher should act as the real leader of the class. A B C D E
6. The teacher should be easy to understand. A B C D E
7. The teacher should be very strict. A B C D E
8. The teacher should find time to listen to class members. A B C D E
9. The teacher should criticize poor work. A B C D E
10. The teacher should tell about changes in atmosphere. A B C D E
11. The teacher should allow the students to argue with him. A B C D E
12. The teacher should keep to himself. A B C D E
13. The teacher should look out for the good of each student. A B C D E
14. The teacher should tell the students which work to do. A B C D E
15. The teacher should be the spokesman (one who speaks for) the class. A B C D E
16. The teacher should make a progress of the work to be done. A B C D E
17. The teacher should insist on good work. A B C D E
18. The teacher should explain his actions. A B C D E
19. The teacher should tell the class what is happening. A B C D E

20. The teacher should do things without talking it over with the class. A B C D E

21. The teacher should back up the class members in what they do. A B C D E

22. The teacher should make getting things done on time important. A B C D E

23. The teacher should treat all the members of the class as if they are as good as he is. A B C D E

24. The teacher should try to have things done the same way each day. A B C D E

25. The teacher should get what he asks for from the principal. A B C D E

26. The teacher should be willing to make some changes. A B C D E

27. The teacher should make sure that the students understand what the teacher is there to do. A B C D E

28. The teacher should be friendly and easy to talk to. A B C D E

29. The teacher should ask that the students follow the regular rules. A B C D E

30. The teacher should do the necessary things. A B C D E

31. The teacher should make the students feel comfortable when they talk with him. A B C D E

32. The teacher should let the students know what is expected of them. A B C D E

33. The teacher should speak as the representative of the class. A B C D E

34. The teacher should use suggestions made by the students. A B C D E

35. The teacher should see to it that students are working as hard as they can. A B C D E

36. The teacher should let the students take over the leadership of the class. A B C D E

37. The teacher should get the principal to help the students. A B C D E

38. The teacher should get the class to approve important changes before he makes changes. A B C D E

39. The teacher should see to it that the students work together in an organized way. A B C D E

40. The teacher should keep the class working together as a team. A B C D E

TABLE 10

Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Consideration Under Three Levels of Paternal Occupation of a Selected Sample of Junior and Senior High School Students

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	5.80	2	2.90	--	--
Within Groups	2,634.67	109	24.17		
Total	2,640.47	111			

APPENDIX C

TABLE 11

Analysis of Variance of Expectations for Initiating Structure Under Three Levels of Paternal Occupation for a Selected Sample of Junior and Senior High School Students

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	125.13	2	62.57	1.91	> .05
Within Groups	3,578.79	109	32.83	--	--
Total	3,703.92	111			